

Appln. No. 10/767,177
Amdt. dated March 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

REMARKS

In the January 12, 2005 Office Action, a restriction requirement and an election of species requirement were made.


In response, Applicant has amended certain claims as noted above as to form.

In addition, between the Group I claims 1-25 and 33-39 drawn to an electrical connector, and the Group II claims 26-32 drawn to a method, Applicant elects the Group I claims 1-25 and 33-39 with traverse. Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement because the apparatus and method claims are so related that searching either the apparatus or method claims would reasonably necessitate the searching of the other. That is, the instant apparatus claims directed to a specific kind of electrical connector, which electrically connects two members, are significantly related to the instant method claims directed to a specific method of electrically connecting the same two members. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

Moreover, between the species of Figs. 1-12 and the species of Figs. 13-15, Applicant elects the species of Figs. 1-12 for further prosecution without traverse. Applicant agrees with the recitation in the Action that claims 1-25, 34, and 35 read on the species of Figs. 1-12, and that claims 33 and 36 are generic to both species.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests prompt and favorable examination of claims 1-39.

Respectfully submitted,



Alfred N. Goodman
Reg. No. 26,458

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: March 14, 2005